



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ances, and immemorial habit in education, the ancient languages have no monopoly of disciplinary value over the modern; but the best illustration will be found in a language that is at least foreign. Note the progress of a boy in mastering a new sentence in Goethe or Cicero, from the time when it is almost a blank, to the time when its meaning is clear to him. In every step of the process he has been using judgment—in a crude and halting way, of course, but he does better and better as he goes on. I am not here speaking of the quality of the immediate result. In translation there is room for the best that the best can give, discernment, precision, delicacy of insight, felicity of phrase; but even in the case of a beginner the problem which every sentence presents must be dealt with by bringing all past knowledge and experience to bear, consciously or unconsciously, in weighing the problems of the present case.

"Unconscious growth in judgment is the fruit of this drill. It ripens through familiarity with linguistic essentials, accuracy, insight, and alertness of mental action.

"It is of course progressive, carrying forward the mastery of the language as an instrument of thought, cultivating accurate habits of investigation—the very attitude of science.

"Then its humanizing influence—the student is all the time broadening the way to a better knowledge of the mental and spiritual life of the people whose literature he is reading.

"It is easy to see that our ideal in this respect will be best attained not by reading through books or lecturing on books merely, but by the most thorough and exacting treatment of limited areas of text".

FIRST YEAR LATIN

There is a very definite pleasure which does not come from any special papers, nor even from informal conversations in such meetings as that of The Classical Association of the Middle States in April last. To the teacher of Classics wearied by the heated struggle to defend his subject among unbelievers, there comes, like a cool sea breeze on a stifling morning, the consciousness that at last he has entered an assembly where Greek and Latin are in good repute. Conference and co-operation moreover have in the last ten years been bringing teachers of the Classics some results that are not mere matters of sentiment. The examinations of the College Entrance Board are rapidly doing away with the *sui generis* papers of individual colleges, with the indispensable necessity of teaching one student the distributive for 999, and of getting another so well versed in clever facility that he can

promptly put "unqualified success" into Latin. Still further help comes from the recent effort to define the vocabulary reasonably required of students entering college. Is it unreasonable to ask that we should confer a little as to what is 'essential' in our first year's work and seek for more uniformity there? While it is true that most beginning books make identically the same statement of their aim "to prepare the student to read Caesar", the variety of methods employed shows that we do not really agree as to what is fundamental for such preparation.

That the principal inflections must be taught no one denies. The different tables of contents show, it is true, the greatest variation in the order in which the forms are treated, but all books include the declensions and conjugations and the common irregular verbs. It is in the method of teaching the forms that differences are most marked, and if we may judge from the reports of entrance examinations for the last two years where 42 and 46 per cent. of the candidates have failed in grammar and 63 and 54 per cent. in elementary composition, there is yet room for improvement. The papers of previous years have shown that after four or five years of Latin *castras* and *potesse*, not to mention *docuissentur*, slip like oil from the pen, that *posset* seems to pupils the form of *possum* to use for any mood or tense or person, and that the second singular of a deponent verb can utterly undo a student in a passage for sight translation. In view of these difficulties too much can hardly be said in commendation of the books that emphasize the use and meaning of the tense signs and verbal endings, for no student can be said to be properly trained in forms who cannot from the outset, if the parts are given, conjugate a new verb according to a paradigm. If the paradigm was *docco*, for example, let the student be tested not always on that, but on *moveo* or *iubeo* until the matter of perfect endings is not a mystery or a lottery, and until forms like *docuevi* and *rexavi* disappear forever from the face of the earth.

In order to help the student retain these forms most books give sentences illustrative of each new inflection introduced, combining with the drill in forms a systematic study of syntax. The principle on which this well-known method is based is thus defined by one of the editors: "the acquisition of facts should be accompanied by immediate use of the knowledge gained". This was the much-needed and obvious remedy for the ways of some fifty or even twenty-five years ago, when the attempt was made to teach not only the forms but a considerable amount of syntax before the student saw a page of Latin, and it has held its own against the 'Inductive Method', which could hardly do for the dull pupil and the large class what it did for the very clever,

and so was wont to leave in its train a straggling and bewildered host. Yet this generally accepted method of most Beginning Books has some dangers and some objectors. The tendency of the young student to consider the sentences to be translated from English to Latin as the chief part of his work, and to neglect the study of the Latin sentences and even of the rules and forms has seemed to a recent editor so serious that he practically does away with the prepared written English-Latin sentences during the study of the inflections. "The student", he says, "should become familiar in the first year, not with the bad Latin which he himself laboriously writes, but with the good Latin which Julius Caesar wrote". The sentence written in class and the oral work he considers the best training for the beginner. "Instead of spending his study period trying to write sentences which are not going to be sufficiently explained till the morrow, the student should spend his study period wrestling with those principles". Another editor, however, having some knowledge of the difficulty of making young students study anything that does not have to be handed in or written on the board, lays the chief emphasis on the home preparation of the English-Latin sentence because "written work for the study-hour secures the best concentration and the surest results". A third, who wishes to urge thoroughness, and courage in the face of difficulties, adds his testimony as regards the failure of existing methods: "Real acquisition is a delight and nothing has done so much to create a distaste for Latin or caused so many to drop the language at the end of the first year as careless work in the beginning and the useless half knowledge resulting therefrom". A little reflection upon these criticisms and the difficulties that they imply raises the question whether we are not involved as much in a matter of practical teaching, as of philosophical principle. If we are willing to descend from the high mount of pedagogy to the valley of our humiliation shall we not admit that it is within the teacher's power ultimately to see that the student reads his Latin-English sentences and studies his rules before he writes the English-Latin, whether it be by postponing the English-Latin to be used as a written and prepared review, or as a test of the other part of the lesson, or by sight sentences and oral work on the same principles that will drive home to the student his ignorance and negligence at once, or by sundry forms of 'moral suasion' not unfamiliar to most of us. Oral recitations may only reach the bright student that volunteers, written sentences may represent the help of classmates or older students in the school. Most methods may be diverted from their aim and perverted in the using, but it is surely the business of the teacher to

test the student often enough to know how his work is done and what knowledge is permanently his own.

The exact proportion of written and oral work may well vary according to the size and caliber of classes and the special interest of teachers, but the question of how much syntax should be taught in first year Latin and at what stage of the year, the problem of where inflections and syntax meet, and where they separate is a matter of much more serious import, and one as to which there should be more general agreement. That they can be very thoroughly separated in the student's mind is capable of easy proof. A student in a college entrance paper has been known to get 80 or more in the test on grammar and 10 in elementary composition, even though the questions in syntax in the one reappeared in the sentences to be put into Latin. A child's comment on a boy whom he met in the park reciting the verbs like a parrot may be in point. "He could say them fast enough but I don't know what good they did him when he couldn't say 'he loves' or understand *amatur*". Too much practice can hardly be demanded of young students in applying their knowledge of forms by writing as well as by reading.

That we do, however, hinder the progress of beginners in learning their forms by intermingling too much syntax with their first lessons there is little reason to doubt. It is the impression of too many children after two months of Latin that the chief thing to learn is the ablative, and that of this case there is no end. It is the impression of too many writers of beginning books that no construction that occurs several times in Caesar can in decency be omitted from the exercises. Such editors make the exercises not merely a means of illustrating inflections, but of exhausting syntax. The appearance of an infinitive form to them is the signal for introducing all the constructions of indirect discourse even to the conclusions of conditional sentences, while the gerund necessitates a full treatment of all its uses. Hence we find tables of contents speeding from the subjunctive of purpose and result through *quin*-clauses, conditional sentences and all the uses of the gerundive. Can it be that there are no Caesar teachers that also have first year Latin, or has no one the courage to admit that the conditional and *quin*-clauses, not to mention *antequam*- and *priusquam*-clauses are still an unploughed field to most students that begin Caesar, as in our opinion they should be? Is it not reasonable to ask why from eight to twelve chapters should be given hastily to subjects which the student is seldom found to remember the next year? Is it not better logic and better economy to teach a few things that will stay rather than many that will melt like dew before

the morning sun? If so, what are the few, and upon what principle are we to select them?

At once there appears an array of enthusiastic Latin teachers, eager to tell that their classes do not need to reduce the number of constructions studied, that *quin* and *antequam* present no difficulties to them. Most teachers of long experience recall proud years when their classes found all these things simple and seemed to master most of the grammar in a year. But in the light of many opportunities to see results, we realize that the things we so proudly counted acquired were for the most part only temporarily retained, like a few pieces of furniture bought on the installment plan and held by a tenure quite as uncertain. A fair class under a good teacher can no doubt be taught even *futurum fuisse ut* in beginning Latin, and with sufficient drill can retain it for an examination even over a term or two, but other things must be sacrificed. We come to see that these more difficult constructions, even if mastered temporarily the first year, do not become a permanent part of the student's knowledge of Latin, do not enable him to attack an easy passage of Caesar at sight, and do, if recalled at all, seem to cloud his vision when he ought to be looking for the agreement of his verb with its subject, and the case of the relative pronoun. Even if these things can be taught there is grave reason to doubt whether they should be.

SUSAN BRALEY FRANKLIN

THE ETHICAL CULTURE SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY

(To be concluded)

REVIEWS

The Latin Language: a historical outline of its sounds, inflections, and syntax. By Charles E. Bennett. Boston: Allyn and Bacon (1907). Pp. xiii + 258.

The Latin Language is the title given to the revised edition of the Appendix to Bennett's Latin Grammar. Although the new title seems somewhat too inclusive, we are glad to see this concise handbook appear under any name that may invite an even larger following than it has so deservedly had; for there are many who believe with me that no American text-book in Latin of the last twenty-five years has had a more salutary influence than this one in giving half-trained teachers some much-needed data about the fundamentals of the Latin language. There may be worthier books, but they have not been written with the same power to reach the needy ones quickly. I suggested that the title seems pretentious. Perhaps a slinking sort of patriotism would make one hesitate to place this book on the same shelf as Lindsay and Sommer for all its Varronian name; yet we must face the fact that nine-tenths of our Latin teachers have no ac-

cess to the latter—I almost said, do not know the latter—and find in Bennett clearly and sanely stated the essentials of the larger works. We know a few Ph.D.'s also who could spend a few evenings with Bennett's Latin Language to advantage.

The new edition has omitted some ten pages of the former and added about forty. The changes are, in fact, so extensive that no one who relies upon Bennett should be satisfied with the Appendix. As the former edition is so extensively used and has been adequately reviewed, I may confine this notice mainly to an indication of the principal changes.

On pp. 31-35 Bennett, largely influenced by the studies of Hale and Dennison, abandons the old rule of syllabification for the new one that "in combinations of consonants, the first consonant is joined to the preceding vowel".

As regards hidden quantity Bennett had in the Appendix followed Marx in the main, recording his doubts, however, regarding the length of vowels before *gn* and *gm*. He now "provisionally accepts" Buck's refutation of Marx (Class. Rev., xv. 311). In consequence of this and other changes, the word-list on pp. 56-72 has been considerably revised.

Vendryes' researches have led him to alter his views on the Latin accent quite materially. He now thinks it extremely probable that the accent in Cicero's day was musical. Will not Abbott's compromise view (Class. Phil. ii. 444 ff.) go far towards settling this vexing question?

The chapters on Latin sounds and inflections have received some minor additions and corrections, but are still very brief in proportion to the chapters on Hidden Quantity and on Moods. It should not be so frequently necessary under so comprehensive a title to end an all too brief paragraph with a remark like "The whole subject is too intricate for detailed consideration here. See Lindsay". In his discussion of the case-constructions, Bennett usually keeps on conservative ground. The points most liable to question are probably the following: his insistence on finding a single basic conception for each of the cases, the acceptance of the appositional origin for the accusative in phrases like *meam vicem*, the reference of the genitive with *refert* to a subjective genitive while recognizing the pronoun *mea* with *refert* as a possessive modifying *re*.

The chapter on the moods receives the largest changes. There is now a useful historical paragraph on the terminology, some new paragraphs on the supposed original force of each mood, in deference to the recent work of Morris—whose results, however, he does not accept—and some additional eight pages on substantive clauses, as a result of his work with Durham (see Cornell Studies xiii). He now omits the chapter on relative clauses which was